

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-4 were pending and all of the claims were rejected in the present Office action. The specification has been amended to obviate the objection to the title of the application, and to claim priority to a Japanese application, which claim has previously been asserted and acknowledged. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

The asserted priority claim is perfected by the attached certified translation of the corresponding Japanese patent application, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.55 (4), and the Applicants respectfully request that the attached certified translation be made a part of the prosecution record.

Objection to Title

The title was objected to as not being descriptive of the invention to which the claim is directed. The Applicants have rewritten the title and request that the Examiner withdraw the objection. If the new title is objected to, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a title in the next Office Action.

Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Choi (U.S. Patent 6,831,711); Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi; and Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haim (U.S. Patent 4,637,687) in view of Yamauchi (U.S. Patent 6,847,427).


The Applicants have perfected the claim to a priority date of October 24, 2002 for the present application, by submitting a certified copy of the Japanese application to which priority is claimed. Choi was filed in the United States on June 3, 2003, and Yamauchi was filed in the United States on May 22, 2003. The priority date for each of the references is antedated by the priority date of the present application. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully traverse the application of Choi and Yamauchi as references under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Further, the application of a reference under 35 U.S.C.

- ✓ §103(a) is predicated on the appropriateness of the reference under 35 U.S.C. §102. Absent these references, a *prima facie* case of anticipation of Claims 1, 2, and 4 and, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 1-4 has not been made out, and Claims 1-4 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that a telephone interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200